DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 960 JC 760 412

TITLE Annual Report, School Year 1975-76.
INSTITUTION Gulf Regional Interstate Collegiate Consortium.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 65p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Evaluation; Cocurricular Activities; *Conference Reports; *Consortia; Faculty Evaluation; *Inservice Programs; *Junior Colleges; Personnel Management; Post Secondary Education; *Universities; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Gulf Regional Interstate Collegiate Consortium

ABSTRACT

Members of the Gulf Regional Interstate Collegiate Consortium include nine junior colleges and seven universities in Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. This annual report presents the highlights of the consortium's activities for 1975-76. Included are the proceedings of four inservice workshops, the minutes of four Executive Council meetings, and suggested topics for consortium programs for 1976-77. The workshops dealt with the following subjects: evaluation of faculty, staff, and administrators; personnel management; increased student activity and involvement; and the role of occupational education in higher education. (DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Gulf Regional Interstate Collegiate Consortium

ALABAMA

ALABAMA LUTHERAN ACADEMY AND COLLEGE
BISHOP STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE
FAULKNER STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE

LOUISIANA

DELGADO JUNIOR COLLEGE
CITY PARK CAMPUS
ALGIERS CAMPUS
SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY AT BATON ROUGE
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY AT NEW ORLEANS
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY AT SHREVEPORT
ST. BERNARD PARISH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHWESTERN LOUISIANA

MISSISSIPPI

MISSISSIPPI GULF COAST JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT
PERKINSTON CAMPUS
JEFFERSON DAVIS CAMPUS
JACKSON COUNTY CAMPUS
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
USM - GULF PARK
USM - NATCHEZ

CHAIRMAN
HERB CARNATHAN
MISSISSIPPI GULF COAST JUNIOR COLLEGE
POST OFFICE BOX 27
PERKINSTON, MS 39573
OFFICE TELEPHONE (601) 928-7211
HOME TELEPHONE (601) 864-9487

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED126960

Annual Report

School Year 1975-76

JC 760 412

GRICC - 1975-76

Institution	President	Executive Council Member
Alabama Lutheran Academy & College Selma, AL 36701	Dr. Willis Wright	S. C. Kaushik, Ed.D. Prof. of Education
S.D. Bishop State Junior College 351 North Broad Mobile, AL 36606	Dr. S.D. Bishop	Mr. Willie F. Taylor Director Student Personnel
Faulkner State Junior College Bay Minette, AL 36507	Dr. Lathem N. Sibert	Mr. Larry Purdy Coordinator of Federal Programs
Delgado Junior College 615 City Park Avenue New Orleans, LA 70119	Dr. Marvin E. Thames	Dr. Cecil L. Groves Vice President, Campus Operations and Academic Affairs - Mr. Frank T. Carroll, Dean
Southeastern Louisiana University University Station Hammond, LA 70401	Dr. Clea E. Parker	Dr. Warren Fortenberry Coordinator Institutes and Workshops
Southern University System Baton Rouge, LA 70813	Dr. Jesse N. Stone	Dr. Roosevelt Steptoe Vice President Dr. Asa Sims, Dean Academic Affairs
St. Bernard Parish Community College Chalmette, LA 70043	Mr. Joseph J. Davies, Jr.	Mr. Harold J. Clavier College Director
University of Southwestern Louisiana Lafayette, LA 70501	Dr. Ray Authement	Dr. Allen St.Martin Dean of Community & School Services
University of Southern Mississippi Southern Station Hattiesburg, MS 39401	Dr. Aubrey K. Lucas	Dr. J. O. Carson Professor-Higher Education Department
Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College P. O. Box 27 Perkinston, MS 39573	Dr. J. J. Hayden, Jr.	Mr. Herb Carnathan Administrative Assistant Institutional Research

INDEX

Calendar of Events - 1976-76	i
Fourth Annual Report, Chairman, Executive Council	ii-iv
Proceedings - October 14, 1975 Workshop	1-20
Proceedings - January 6, 1976 Workshop	21-23
Proceedings - February 27, 1976 Workshop	24-30
Proceedings - April 27, 1976 Workshop	31-50
Minutes - October 14, 1975 Executive Council Meeting	51-52
Minutes - January 6, 1976 Executive Council Meeting	53-54
Minutes - February 27, 1976 Executive Council Meeting	55
Suggested Topics for GRICC Programs - 1976-77	56
Minutes - April 27, 1976 Executive Council Meeting	57

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM
for School Year 1975-76

October 14, 1975
Workshop - Evaluation of Faculty, Staff and Administrators
Chalmette, Louisiana
Sponsored by St. Bernard Parish Community College
Executive Council Meeting

January 6, 1976
Workshop - Personnal Management
New Orleans, Louisiana
Sponsored by Southern University of New Orleans
Executive Council Meeting

February 27, 1976
Workshop - Increased Student Activity and Involvement
Mobile, Alabama
Sponsored by Bishop State Junior College
Executive Council Meeting

April 27, 1976
Workshop - The Role of Occupational Education in Higher Education
Bay Minette, Alabama
Sponsored by James H. Faulkner State Junior College
Executive Council Meeting

June 30, 1976
Board of Director's Meeting
Perkinston, Mississippi
Sponsored by Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM (GRICC)
SCHOOL YEAR - 1975-76

The fourth year of its existence was a memorable one for the Gulf Regional Interstate Collegiate Consortium. In-service workshops were held on three institutions that had not formerly been visited by the Consortium. One university member gained a new president, and the cooperative spirit that has been the backbone of GRICC's success exceeded that shown in previous years.

Your Executive Council Chairman cannot sufficiently express his appreciation to fellow members of the Executive Council. Council members have faithfully attended meetings, volunteered their efforts, talents and resources of their institutions, and have shown a cooperative attitude that could only cause an already excellent organization to strive for higher achievements and results; and achieve them. And that is what has happened in school year 1975-76.

As Chairman, I would like to express my most profound appreciation and gratitude for their splendid efforts. I would urge presidents of institutions involved to recognize the quality work done on behalf of the Consortium by their executive council members.

Activities of the year were representative of the three-state area; with two meetings held in Louisiana, two in Alabama and one in Mississippi. Again, exhibiting the diverse nature of the Consortium, meetings were hosted by both junior and senior colleges and universities. They were hosted by one predominantly black junior college and a senior college, and by predominantly white junior colleges. Program participants ranged from students to persons holding doctorates; they represented both sexes and both black and white races. GRICC is a truly nondescriminatory organization in its fullest sense.

The first meeting of the year was held at St. Bernard Parish Community College on October 14, 1975. Presided over by Harold Clavier, its subject was "Evaluation of Faculty, Staff and Administrators." Highlights of the one day workshop included a tour of the combined high school and junior college operations, with a welcome by Mr. Buford Jones, Superintendent, St. Bernard Parish School Board. Major addresses were presented by Mr. Bob Johnson, Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College; Mrs. Jeannie Kreamer, University of Southwestern Louisiana; Mr. Frank Miller, S. D. Bishop State Junior College; Mr. John T. Purser, Southeastern Louisiana University; and Dr. Robert E. Riehl, St. Bernard Parish Community College. (See pages 1 through 20 for proceedings of this meeting.)

The second meeting, originally scheduled to be held by the Southern University System in Baton Rouge, was held on the Southern University of New Orleans Campus on January 6, 1976. Presided over by Dr. Asa Sims, Dean of Academic Affairs, SUNO, its subject was "Personnel Management." Dr. Emmett Bashful welcomed the group. Principal speakers were: Dr. Henry Wiggins, Southern University and Dr. Jim Firnberg, Louisiana State University. (See pages 21 through 23 for proceedings of this meeting.)

February, 1976 saw the Consortium move its activities to Alabama. The S. D. Bishop State Junior College hosted a workshop in Mobile. Hosted by W. F. Taylor, this meeting dealt with "Increased Student Activity and Involvement."

The morning session constituted one of the most memorable sessions in the history of the Consortium. Students from both commuter and live-in colleges and from two and four year institutions discussed several aspects of getting the student involved. College administrators and faculty members present were tremendously impressed with the honesty,candor and interest expressed by the students. In the afternoon, Mrs. Alice Rusbar, Delgado Junior College, presented a most interesting paper. (See pages 24 through 30 for proceedings of this meeting.)

The last in-service workshop of the year was hosted by James H. Faulkner State Junior College in Bay Minette, Alabama on April 27, 1976. Hosted by Bert Beck, the subject was "The Role of Occupational Education in Higher Education." Principal speakers were: Dr. J. O. Carson, University of Southern Mississippi; Dr. Tom Nevitt, University of Southwestern Louisiana, and Mrs. Trish H. McLaney, Alabama State Department of Education. Dr. Lathem N. Sibert welcomed the group to his institution. (See pages 31 through 50 for proceedings of this meeting.)

From the above list of distinguished hosts and speakers, it is apparent that persons in attendance received more than their money's worth for attending the excellent meetings. Again, the interstate nature of the Consortium was exhibited in each of the meetings.

Business of the Consortium was conducted at well attended executive council meetings held at noon on each day of the Inservice workshops. Minimum time was required to be expended in these meetings because of the splendid cooperation and planning done by the council the previous year. In addition to insuring a successful year for 1975-76, planning for 1976-77 commenced in October, 1975 with the council being asked to recommend topics for that year and for recommendations on whether to publish the Consortium Directory of Interests. It was subsequently decided that publication of the Directory would be the responsibility of the new chairman.

A review of the minutes of the Executive Council meetings will reveal that host officials were provided ideas and assistance in preparing for their meetings; ideas for following year programs were suggested; names and ideas for papers to be presented were furnished and other business was conducted with dispatch.

Minutes of the Executive Council Meetings are found on pages through of this report.

The following program for 1976-77 is recommended:

DATE	SUBJECT	LOCATION
9-21-76	Fine Arts Department Meeting	Delgado Junior College
10-26-76	Placement Services	University of Southern Mississippi
2-15-77	Long Range Planning	Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College
4-29-77	Public Relations	University of Southwestern Louisiana
*	Annual Board of Director's Meeting	*

* To be determined by the new Executive Council Chairman.

Your Chairman would like to close with these thoughts. At the June 30, 1976 Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors a new Executive Council Chairman will be elected. The domicile of the Consortium will move to the host institution of the Chairman. On behalf of Dr. J. J. Hayden, Jr., President, Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College, present domicile of the Consortium and the undersigned, we would like to express our gratitude to each member of the Council, their Presidents, faculty and staffs for the exemplary hospitality extended to us and to the entire Consortium for the two year period we have been honored to host the Gulf Regional Interstate Collegiate Consortium. We have individually and collectively broadened our educational horizons by participating in this group of institutions and by associating with the fine people with whom we have dealt.

Again, on behalf of Dr. Hayden and the undersigned, we pledge our unqualified continued support to the new chairman and his domicile institution, and to the efforts that have made the Gulf Regional Interstate Collegiate Consortium the truly outstanding organization it now is, and will continue to be.

Respectfully submitted,

Herb Carnathan

Herb Carnathan, Chairman
Executive Council
Gulf Regional Interstate Collegiate Consortium

PROCEEDINGS OF

THE GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM (GRICC)
IN-SERVICE WORKSHOP

EVALUATION OF FACULTY, STAFF AND ADMINISTRATORS

Hosted by: Harold Clavier

St. Bernard Parish Community College
Chalmette, Louisiana
October 14, 1975

GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM
ST. BERNARD PARISH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CHALMETTE, LOUISIANA - OCTOBER 14, 1975

"Evaluation of Faculty, Staff and Administrators"

Presiding: Harold J. Clavier, Director, St. Bernard Parish Community College

9:00 a.m. Coffee and Donuts

9:30 a.m. Tour of Model School Facilities

9:50 a.m. Welcome Address: Mr. Buford Jones, Superintendent, St. Bernard Parish School Board

10:00 a.m. "Evaluation in Academia - Can it be Done and How Well?", Mr. Bob Johnson, Executive Assistant-Education, Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College

10:20 a.m. "The Status of Faculty and Administrator Evaluation at USL", Mrs. Jeannie Kreamer, Assistant Director of Institutional Research, University of Southwestern Louisiana

10:40 a.m. "Some Objective Instruments for Faculty Evaluation", Mr. Frank Miller, Academic Dean, S. D. Bishop State Junior College

11:00 a.m. BREAK

11:20 a.m. "Faculty Evaluation", Mr. John T. Purser, Director of Institutional Research, Southeastern Louisiana University

11:40 a.m. "Evaluation and Teacher Accountability", Dr. Robert E. Riehl, Instructor of English, St. Bernard Parish Community College

12:00 noon LUNCH

1:30 p.m. Small Group Meetings

Group A;
Chairman: Dr. Asa C. Sims, Jr., Dean of Academic Affairs, Southern University in New Orleans

Group B;
Chairman: Dr. Burton C. Beck, Dean of Instruction, Faulkner State Junior College

2:30 p.m. Group Summaries: Group Chairman

2:50 p.m. Conference Summary:
Dr. Cecil Groves, Vice-President, Delgado Junior College

LIST OF CONFEREES

GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM

MEETING (GRICC)

ALABAMA

S. D. Bishop Junior College: 1

Mr. W. F. Taylor, Director of Student Personnel Services

Faulkner State Junior College: 1

Dr. Burton Beck, Dean of Instruction

MISSISSIPPI

Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College: 7

Dr. J. J. Hayden, Jr., President
Mr. Herb Carnathan, Administrative Assistant/Institutional Research
Mr. Travis Ferguson, Coordinator of Vocational Technical
Mr. Clyde Strickland, Director of Instruction, Perkinston Campus
Mr. G. L. Douglas, Director of Instruction, Jefferson Davis Campus
Dr. Bobby Garvin, Director of Instruction, Jackson County Campus
Mr. Bob Johnson, Executive Assistant-Education

University of Southern Mississippi: 1

Dr. J. O. Carson, Professor of Junior College Administration

LOUISIANA

Delgado Junior and Community College: 12

Dr. Cecil Groves, Vice-President, Delgado Junior College
Mr. Frank Carroll, Dean, City Park Campus
Mr. Thomas V. Flair, Delgado, West Bank
Dr. Raymond P. Witte, Dean, Community Services

Delgado Junior and Community College, continued:

Ms. Angel Delacroix, Director of Research & Grants Management
Ms. Carmen Smith, Instructor, West Bank
Ms. Alice Rusbar, Research Associate, Research & Grants Management
Mr. Raymond J. Garrity, Educational Planning Officer
Mr. Melvin Uzee, Associate Professor and Dean, Occupational Trades Technology Division
Mr. W. Bob Creel, Associate Professor, Sociology

St. Bernard Parish Community College: 11

Mr. Buford Jones, Superintendent of Schools
Mr. Harold J. Clavier, College Director
Mr. George Schlorff, Coordinator of Continuing Education
Dr. Bob Riehl, Instructor of English
Mr. Norman Hall, Instructor of History
Ms. V. A. Nuschler, Instructor of Mathematics
Ms. Georgette Hall, Librarian
Mr. Clifford Ladner, Instructor of Biological Sciences
Mr. Norman McKay, Instructor of Business
Ms. Jo Ann Stasney, Instructor of Art
Ms. Elaine Starnes, Instructor of English

University of Southwestern Louisiana: 2

Ms. Jean Kreamer, Assistant Director of Institutional Research
Mr. Allen St. Martin, Director, Institutional Research

Southern University System: 1

Mr. Asa C. Sims, Jr., Dean of Academic Affairs, Southern University in New Orleans

EVALUATION IN ACADEMIA -- CAN IT BE DONE, AND HOW WELL?

by

Robert L. Johnson

As Diogenes searched for an honest man, educators worldwide have sought a reliable and valid instrument for measuring faculty and staff performance and whatever else is necessary in the makeup of an effective teacher. Not hundreds, but thousands, of forms locally produced and standardized are available to any administrator to choose from or combine in order to produce a usable, practical, common-sense evaluation device. If a perfect technique had been discovered in the more than 2000 years of organized education endeavors, we would probably all have it; we would probably all use it; we could end our search.

In our complex and less than perfect scholastic society, there are some good teachers, many adequate teachers, and some bad teachers; administrators must attempt to evaluate faculty members in order to have some basis for retention and promotion and most of all, to help improve instruction. In making these judgments, administrators may say that teaching is a heavily weighted factor. The question then is this: Why don't administrators, in reality, put more emphasis on teaching performance in faculty appraisals? The answer, in brief, lies in the problems of evaluating teaching.

FIRST, THERE IS THE DIFFICULTY OF DEFINING GOOD TEACHING, which is the initial step of evaluation. Good teaching, like beautiful women, is a subject on which everyone has his own idea and thinks he can recognize on sight. In short, like beautiful women, good teaching is too often thought of in the abstract. Specifically, discussions of good teaching usually center on knowledge of subject matter, on an understanding of students,

and the like. But this is not precise enough. What is needed in addition, it would seem, is first a clear statement of the objectives of a course and what is meant by good teaching in that subject; and second, a clear statement of the purposes of a particular institution, and what is meant by good teaching at that institution. Inherent in both of these specifics is the fact that dispensing fragmented subject matter, no matter how well done, does not constitute good teaching. Instead, good teaching implies that each course has some relevance to its own field and to other fields of knowledge. Thus, in the final analysis, the question is not "What is good teaching?", but "What is good teaching in 'X' course within 'Y' field at 'Z' institution?"

THE SECOND GENERAL PROBLEM IN EVALUATING TEACHING CAN BE STATED QUITE SIMPLY: HOW? One of the most logical methods of evaluating teaching is by testing student achievement. Although this can be done by merely assessing what students have learned at the end of a course, pre-testing as well as post-testing students is necessary for more valid conclusions. Desirable changes in students are, certainly, the ultimate criteria of effective college teaching, but these changes involve the affective as well as the cognitive domain and are difficult to measure. The lack of adequate instruments and a lack of norms to test outcomes are just two of the limitations. More important, changes in student attitudes, values, and even knowledge are likely influenced by many factors such as student motivation, maturation, personal traits, campus climate, and peer group contacts. Hence, how does one measure the changes due solely to the quality of teaching? And finally, the most significant outcome of effective teaching may not be truly reflected in a test score or interview following completion of the course, but rather in the continued learning and value patterns of the

student many years later.

Several other methods are used to evaluate teaching, and all are less objective than the pre- and post-testing method. The most commonly used methods are student ratings, informal student opinion, classroom visitations, colleagues' opinions, and the opinions of a chairman or dean. There are varying degress of objectivity in these methods. The opinions of chairmen and deans in evaluating a faculty member's teaching ability are probably the least objective method used. Most often, these opinions are based on hearsay alone. Colleagues' opinions may be based on a greater number of contacts than opinions by chairmen or deans, but their subjectivity is no less a problem. Somewhat more objective, however, are evaluations based on classroom observations. But because most faculty regard classroom observations and ratings by supervisors or peers as both a threat to their security and an invasion of privacy, they often strongly resent this method. These evaluations are usually further discredited by the infrequency of observations, the lack of definable criteria, and the tendency for some teachers to react unnaturally while being observed.

The advocates of formal student ratings of instruction argue that we get a better idea of the merits of the dinner from the dinner guests than from the cook. There is every indication that in certain areas, student ratings of instruction can be valid and useful. Past studies, on the whole, indicate that student judgments of classroom procedures and student-teacher interaction are more reliable then overall student judgments of the instructor himself. Students can accurately report, for example, whether the material was clearly presented, whether they were stimulated to work in a course, whether objectives were made clear, and whether the course seemed worthwhile to them. But, just as many a dinner guest is not able to judge

the finer points of a meal, students also are not necessarily classroom connoisseurs. Students, for instance, cannot report as accurately other aspects of effective teaching, such as the instructor's qualifications in the subject, the soundness of objectives, the validity of reference material, and the intrinsic merit of the course. Hence, in devising a rating form, it is important that the sphere of inquiry center around organization of course activities, and instructional techniques and procedures. If it does, research indicates that student ratings of instruction will likely be consistent with those made be trained observers. Student ratings, however, will tend to be less valid when limited to the qualifications and characteristics of the instructor, for too often students equate good teaching with an exuberant personality and an entertaining manner of lecturing.

Dr. Irene Kiernan, in the April edition of the Community and Junior College Journal, indicates she does not regard student evaluation as highly as many of us. You will recall, she lists 10 weaknesses of student ratings and concludes the article by stating, "All these points lead to the question of how valid any present student evaluations are. Is liking the teacher an evaluation of the teacher's excellence? Present student evaluations appear to measure only one thing: whether or not students like their teacher. The Rodin and Rodin study indicates that students rate most highly those faculty members from whom they learn the least. They point out that the only objective method of evaluating teacher effectiveness is whether or not the students have learned. The subjective methods of evaluation find out whether or not students like the teacher. Who has measured that liking equals learning? Without such a measure, who can say that popularity means effective teaching?"

I personally feel that student evaluations help evaluate teachers, but they have weaknesses and must be supplemented by other methods and techniques. Dr. James L. Wattenbarger puts it much better than I in his "Characteristics of a Good Evaluation Program":

"1. Student rating is only one part of a total program of faculty evaluation and must be consonant with the other elements used.
2. Effective evaluation (as differentiated from observation) requires training and orientation of the evaluators.
3. In the rating process, a student has two roles to play: observer and evaluator. As an observer he provides raw and unweighted information not available to anyone else. As an evaluator his major competence is in areas related to the personal effectiveness of the instructor and the establishment of student-instructor rapport.
4. Appropriate indicators of good teaching vary with the course, the subject, and the objectives of the course.
5. The criteria for good teaching should be developed by the teaching faculty and the administrators as well as by students.
6. An institution should develop its own rating instruments.
7. For an evaluation program to be effective, the results must have significance in the incentives for the faculty and in the institution's personnel practices. Similarly, the students must perceive that the ratings have significance.
8. A 'volunteer program' will not achieve the objectives of a sound faculty evaluation procedure."

Perhaps I have dwelt too long on student evaluations to the neglect of the other types. At our institution, we also use peer evaluation, self-evaluation,

evaluation by Department Chairmen and administrators, Adult Education Evaluation for evening students, and follow-up studies which are probably as realistic as any heretofore mentioned. At the Jefferson Davis Campus, a composite is prepared of the student evaluations of all the teachers, all the teachers in a department, and if I am not mistaken, all the instructors in the institution. At a glance, the Executive Dean or the President of the College is able to get a "bird's-eye view" of the caliber of instruction on this campus.

For approximately 20 years, the Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College has attempted to evaluate. In 1971, all faculty members became involved in constructing the instruments used. Various evaluative instruments in use at the colleges and universities throughout the United States were studied prior to completion of the instruments and final approval by the faculty.

Dr. Arthur Cohen, in the Summer 1974 edition of Community College Review, made an interesting and controversial statement: "No instructor has ever been fired from his position in an American community college because his students demonstrably failed to learn what he tried to teach them. Faculty members have been dismissed or forced to resign for many other reasons--usually because they failed to conform to prevailing social mores or because they engaged in unpopular political activities. But no teacher ever lost his job because his student did not learn what he contracted to teach them. Yet, astonishing as this bit of historical information may be, it seems not to have penetrated the consciousness of many faculty members or administrators--not to say legislators--who continue to raise the spectre of teacher dismissal and drag it like a red herring through every meeting on faculty evaluation." This quotation was read because it should be emphasized that we must all keep our eyes fixed on the paramount reason so much time and

effort is devoted to evaluation of all types: the improvement of instruction. Can instruction be improved measurably? Yes, if administrators, teachers, and students cooperate in the endeavor and all realize the goal of the evaluation is to help the learner learn and the teacher teach as nearly to the limits of their capabilities as is humanly possible. If students, faculty members, department chairmen, or administrators use evaluations for ulterior motives, more harm than good will probably result.

How well can it be done? Very well, not well at all, depending on the spirit, cooperation, and motivation of all those involved, and selection or construction of valid and reliable measuring instruments. All of us are evidently interested in faculty evaluation (and this brief talk has been limited to just that) although today evaluation of administrators, staff members, programs and facilities has been undertaken by most if not all of us.

In conclusion, evaluation can be done, it can be done well, and for approximately 2000 years, teachers have been evaluated by observant supervisors by whatever title who were alert enough to see and hear what was taking place in their environment. They knew then, as we know now, the outstanding teachers through feedback: chance remarks, outstanding achievements, success of pupils, and many other subjective indicators some might call intuition which in reality correlate quite highly with good evaluation instruments.

Other speakers today will elaborate, hopefully corroborate or even challenge these few introductory remarks. They were not meant to cover the entire field nor to explain what my institution practices. Evaluation is necessary to any important enterprise. It can be and is done superbly by many post-secondary institutions. It is perhaps done best by those who place their priority on good solid classroom instruction.

THE STATUS OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION AT USL

BY

MRS. JEAN KREAMER
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHWESTERN LOUISIANA

Mr. Clavier, it is indeed a pleasure for us from Southwestern to be able to participate in this conference. I am delighted to be with all of you today. This is my first opportunity to address the GRICC group. Many of you and I had the opportunity to meet this summer, but this is the first opportunity I have had to speak as Assistant of Institutional Research.

I have been in this position only since June 1, and I am still learning as I am sure many of you are learning about student evaluation.

The primary thrust of what I do is to administer student evaluation of instruction since April, 1971. At that time, we instituted a pilot study of 363 students to see just what their reactions would be to a student evaluation of instruction. We received a 75% response from them, indicating that students felt it was a necessary and needed function on our campus.

The primary reasons for our instituting this practice thereafter are these: That written evaluation, would promote the communication between the student and faculty member regarding teaching effectiveness. This was our primary thrust and still is. We also felt that there were certain administrative needs that were not being met on our campus. For instance, if we would gather our student evaluations of data, we might be able to use the data effectively to determine such things as promotion and merit raises. Now this has been a point of controversy on our university campus. From time to time we have used our student evaluations very heavily and from time to time we have not used these as heavily as in the past for reasons previously stated.

We also have an administrative evaluation through which our department heads evaluate the faculty within his department, and have a self evaluation of our faculty. All of these are made available to our administrative hierarchy.

You may be interested in knowing that our first evaluation was very general, basically grading the effectiveness of the instructor and instructions. This is the one from which we received about a 75% response from our students. From the basis of this response we were able to become more sophisticated. We changed our questionnaire approximately three times before arriving at a more permanent questionnaire about a year later.

We again began to ask our students to rate specific things to arrange a more sophisticated form and this is what it looked like for about two years on the questionnaire. We asked students to tell us something about themselves--student characteristics. Also, we asked them to evaluate the actual instruction.

We asked them to evaluate the actual course itself. This evaluation was used throughout the beginning of the fall of 1972 for approximately two years.

Now I would like to tell you how we arrived at these evaluation forms. We have an office of Institutional Research which basically administers the evaluation itself. We also have a faculty committee composed of 15 members of our faculty from throughout the campus. These persons generally receive the correspondence from our faculty members and from our students about our student evaluation of instructions. They also make suggestions to our office concerning possible weaknesses in the evaluation, the procedure itself, how we can improve what we are doing.

Interestingly enough, through the office of our Academic Vice President, we have a student committee composed of students who view various campus functions, supplying valuable student feedback. For instance, at one time we evaluated every class each semester. The faculty felt that this took too much class time for evaluation and that a sampling would be adequate. From student feedback compared to feedback from the faculty committee we, therefore, decided to evaluate persons four times between the fall and spring semesters.

Both committees decided that they would like to see a slight change in the format of our evaluation forms. This summer this questionnaire will go out as our final questionnaire form. What basically has been done is a change in the rating scale and elimination of certain words felt to be discriminatory or not explicit enough.

The beginning of the questionnaire indicates just what student characteristics this individual student represents, an evaluation of the actual instructor himself, a course evaluation and then toward the end of the questionnaire, the student self-evaluation. This semester we hope we can come up with a questionnaire that is agreeable to more students and faculty alike.

You may be interested in knowing that out of the data we have gathered since 1971, the initial pilot study is stored in our data bank at the University. USL, along with MIT, has one of the largest computers on a U.S. college campus.

Our office begins gathering a master list of courses each semester, instructors, number of students in the number of courses, and hours that are taught. On the basis of each of these lists the department head then has the option of choosing which classes and which persons he wishes to have evaluated. Also at this particular time, a faculty member may choose to have his classes evaluated. This information is given back to the office of Institutional Research which also randomly selects additional classes to be surveyed.

On a specific day we initially distribute our questionnaires. Students respond to the questionnaire on port-o-punch cards and will be replacing these with ob scan forms which we are designing at this particular time. Prior to the evaluation a particular date is announced for the evaluation. When the evaluation is given, a person is designated by the instructor, within his classroom, to administer the evaluation itself. The evaluation of a class of 30 takes about 20 minutes. The teacher leaves the room during the evaluation. The instructions are given by the person ordained by that particular instructor. In some departments, department heads actually administer the evaluation. The student responses are put into a large envelope and routed through the secretary of the department to our office. Thereafter, the student data are analyzed by our computer.

At the end of the academic year 1972, a student graduating on the doctoral level in statistics did for his dissertation a study of the data collected from our student evaluation of instruction. Comparing variables this young man found that there were very few variables which correlated significantly.

Part of my first duties have been to initiate an addendum of the same study done three years ago. We are currently in the process of defining our study to compare these variables.

I would like to tell you something that we do in terms of administration evaluation. Through my association with the Dean of our community and High School Relations, we became interested in the evaluation of administrators at USL. There is a definitive work I would like to mention which deals with the evaluation of administrators--Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluations by Richard Miller. It concludes that very little has been done in the area of administration evaluation.

Recently we conducted a study surveying 69 universities. About 30% responded. Of these responding universitites, only three of them indicated that they had any type of concrete written evaluation of administrators. The ones who do evaluate administrators are the University of Florida, University of New Hampshire and the University of Tennessee. Florida had a very extensive type of evaluation which evaluated administrators and professional staff persons such as school attorneys and those others who are academic administrators. Florida went to great lengths to define procedures, etc.

Our University has initiated a faculty study of the feasibility of administrative evaluation, not necessarily on the basis of what we found from the survey, but on the basis of what our faculty and administration feel it needs.

What we hope to do is to establish just what administrative functions exist for the three administrative areas on our campus--that of academic administration, administrative administration and that area of university relations. We do have a form that has been devised by one of our faculty members. We have devised an additional form that may possibly be considered but at this time we are at a very embryonic stage.

I am looking forward to administering my first student evaluation of instruction this semester and hope that this one will be as successful as all the ones in the past have been.

SOME OBJECTIVE INSTRUMENTS IN FACULTY EVALUATION

by

Frank Miller, Academic Dean
S. D. Bishop State Junior College

Presentation by

W. F. Taylor, Director of Student Personnel
S. D. Bishop State Junior College

I share the concerns for evaluation of educational services. To all of these concerns I wish to add a demension that is often overlooked--a performance out-put component. I concede that the most basic purpose of faculty evaluation must be the improvement of instruction and learning. Many programs of faculty evaluation, however, may be a major error (I think) of limiting the evaluation scheme to the assessment of performance phase. In my opinion, any evaluation scheme is incomplete without due consideration for the requirements of the job and its related assignments and talents, they often generate an overload on both time and energy. The things we seek to evaluate--effectiveness and efficiency--can be critically undermined if achievement is not possible under a particular set of circumstances.

It is grossly unfair to the person who is evaluated if the evaluation process does not include a performance out-put component to determine or express the quantity of work to be performed within a given time reference. When this is done, evaluation may be applied as a process of assessing the degree of performance and level of acceptability of that performance at a point in time. I am simply contending here that the evaluator ought to show for the volume of work required of the person to be evaluated. Dr. Richard I. Miller, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Baldwin-Wallace College makes the following observation that supports my point here:

> The overall academic load of the average professor is seriously misunderstood. The hours spent in the class room need to be considered on a two-to-one basis: two hours of preparation for every hour in the classroom. Add a conservative estimate of five hours a week for advising and counseling. Five hours for committee and departmental activities, four hours for correspondence and other academic housekeeping details, and the total becomes fifty hours per week (with a twelve-hour classroom teaching load.) And the professor has not even

begun to do the reading, studying, and research that are essential to keep him on the growing edge of his field.

The burden of too much to do in a given period of time can easily produce quite negative results. Professional liveliness can give way to frustration and laziness of spirit.

You may reasonably ask at this point, how is performance out-put quantified? Let me describe what I have found to be useful. Shortly after classes and faculty assignments are complete, I make a Faculty Load Analysis by divisions indicating instructor, classes, with credit and clock hours, and enrollment. Here I get a picture of class assignments, (full-time and part-time) and credit hours produced by divisions. A second instrument--Survey of Instructor Work-Load--is done on individual sheets listing courses, preparations, lectures and lab hours, enrollment and credit hours produced. This sheet also includes the number of conference hours and special assignments. If the instructor teaches in the day program and in the extended-day program such indication is also made.

I am concerned at this point with performance out-put as a basis for qualitative assessment of total faculty services at another time. A review of the instructor's total work-load-class size and teaching load, administrative duties, committee assignments, sponsorship of clubs or organizations and academic counseling gives me a valid feel for the work required as well as for the expectations of performance as these are tied into the nature of the institution and its goal.

The third instrument--Instructors Grade Tabulations--though quantative by its very nature arouses a more subjective feeling based on personal surmise and personal prejudice. The use to which I put this form is still uncertain in my mind. I am working on it.

In closing, I should like to leave this impression. Of all the faculty services, I conceive classroom teaching to be sine qua non for undergraduate education especially in the community junior college. Classroom instruction here is peculiar to the institution in that the needs of an overwhelming majority of the students require more individual attention and a greater appreciation for their social antecedents. And at the risk of being "old fashioned" it is my hope that classroom teaching will again occupy the place in education it ought to have--the center of the stage. However

classroom activity is evaluated, my abiding concern is that it functions under the most favorable circumstances the administration can provide for both teacher and the learner. The larger the class size at the community junior college level the more difficult the achievement of effectiveness and efficiency become.

Quoted from:

Richard I Miller's Evaluating Faculty Performance
Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers
San Frisco, 1972

EVALUATION AND TEACHER ACCOUNTABILITY

By
Dr. Robert E. Riehl
St. Bernard Parish Community College

At the outset, it might be profitable to define our terms, and delimit the territory. In the case of "Faculty, Staff, Administrator Evaluation", this is not an easy task. My emphasis this morning will be on faculty evaluation by students, that is the evaluation of a given teacher, in a given discipline, and of what possible directions that evaluation may take. And there are many directions open--more sometimes, it seems, that we can handle. However, I would like to concentrate on two possible directions, both involving the stance in which an evaluative instrument places a teacher vis a vis the student. The results of the evaluation are directly determined. It seems to me, by the stance or position in which the teacher finds himself.

In the first stance, a teacher is evaluated by a student as a person, or more often, as a personality. It is this view of evaluation which causes teachers either to shrug and hope for the best, or to rave and rail against those responsible for the construction of the evaluative instrument. This form of evaluation is widespread and, almost without fail, it is presented to teachers in punitive terms, rarely as a means of mutual communication between teacher and administrator and never with the view toward improving teaching. Among those of my acquaintance, teacher evaluation has been either tolerated by instructors and assistants or viewed with outright hostility.

Such reactions give us reason to pause and to question the fundamental purpose of the concept of evaluation itself. How, exactly, do administrators see teacher evaluation? How do teachers? Based on my observations I would have to answer these questions as follows: Administrators seem to gain some satisfaction simply from the fact that evaluation forms are made up, distributed, collected, tabulated and results recorded. There is a certain satisfaction in the very mechanics of all of this activity. Evaluation satisfies the desire, now so prevalent, to quantify and tabulate performance and thus make statistically sure that we are doing a good job--or a rotten one. Whichever the case, the statistics themselves are satisfying. You can hold the copies in your hand and the percentages fall neatly into columns.

On the part of the teacher, I can only answer that evaluation is another, distasteful, part of the job--to be endured and then quickly forgotten. In some cases, it has provided a substantial blow to faculty morale, since teachers often were not aware of criteria upon which they were being judged and were not provided with a key or explanation of the results of the evaluation, results expressed in numerical averages, percentages, and percentile rank--all this, the fruit of the unhappy marriage of education departments with those of computer science. Not only were the results unintelligible, and so, useless to teachers, but the evaluative instrument itself seemed ill conceived and haphazard. Judging from the questions asked, it is difficult to determine exactly what in a teacher is being evaluated. Evaluation forms generally seem to be interested in three kinds of responses: a student's personal interest in the course and his larger college experience; the social attitude of the teacher toward students; and finally, the teacher's professional competence. Of necessity, the questions are couched in the vaguest of terms--

the answer to which would seem to have to be equally vague. Student answers to these questions are collated and then translated into numerical figures and returned to puzzled teachers with no explanation and no interpretations.

The second stance in which an evaluative instrument might place a teacher is one where he is judged as a teacher rather than a personality. This stance might provide a better opportunity for the evaluative instrument to be somewhat more objective, and the concept of teacher accountability may well have something to contribute to the value of the opportunity.

The recent focus on teacher accountability, largely due to the impetus of government agencies in the recent past, offers, perhaps, tangible clues about how we might take a second look at the problem of evaluation of teacher performance. Teacher accountability, as I understand it, simply means that a teacher ought to be held responsible for teaching his students what he should teach them. A major problem arises however, when we attempt to define what is meant by "what he should teach them." Certainly, in each discipline, the nature of this "what" will differ significantly. Since this is so, the evaluative instrument should be specifically designed with that discipline, and that specific part of the discipline, in mind. One must first know his destination before he can know whether he has arrived. But the instrument of evaluation must recognize that there are many journeys and many destinations and that to simplify this fact in order to get a more "scientific" reading, or to satisfy computer demands, is to do an injustice to all involved.

In the field of English, there has been developing, especially since 1970, a heated dialogue concerning the destinations and goals toward which English teachers should be moving. A reevaluation of goals should necessarily imply a reevaluation of evaluation itself, since the problem of goals ought to be paramount in any consideration of the problem of evaluation. If goals are unclear, then what really do we base evaluation on? In an effort to clarify goals in the teaching of English, the National Council of Teachers of English published, under the aegis of its commission on the English curriculum, a series of studies under the general title "On Writing Behavioral Objectives for English." The studies not only did not reach any kind of unanimity, but showed, rather, deep divisions among the various authors. Two years later, in 1972, as a direct result of this study, a second collection was published entitled "Accountability and the Teaching of English" which attempted to "expand the context in which behavioral objectives were viewed and in doing so to look at the matter of teacher accountability." This second volume, to a great extent, pinpointed the difficulties of setting goals for a humanistic discipline in terms of behavioristic theory.

There are, to be sure, no easy answers to the philosophical and pedagogical problems raised in these two studies. But these problems do make us aware that if there is considerable confusion in writing goals and objectives, there is necessarily going to be at least the same confusion in building evaluative instruments which are supposed to measure how effectively goals and objectives are reached. Confusion in the one, necessarily leads to confusion in the other. Considered in this light, evaluation must be a far reaching process whereby the evaluator knows what the destination is, what several paths may be employed in reaching that destination, and what starting point that destination may itself begin. The evaluative instrument, if it is to say anything meaningful, must be directly linked with the stated objectives of a teacher and a discipline.

In his response to James Moffetts' attack on behavioral theory, Donald Seybold writes: "Our task is to write objectives, citing what we believe to be valid goals, that suggest activities and ways to reach those goals. An objective is a guide, not a dictator. The danger is that the teacher will serve it rather than allowing it to serve him. To avoid unintentional servitude to objectives, a teacher needs them phrased carefully and carefully prefaced so they can be carefully applied. Each objective must have flexibility. Each must emphasize the learner. Each must be real, meaningful, and unfragmented. Each must not depend for its existence on limited, one-sided evaluation." What this suggests to me is the need for a very different kind of evaluation than the one we spoke of earlier, one which is much more specific and focused. It would have to concern itself with the objectives of a given teacher within a given discipline, and the constructors of the instrument would certainly have to be much more aware of what their instrument was actually measuring. Such evaluation would demand a greater degree of cooperation and openness between administration and faculty. As the division between the humanists and behaviorists in the field of English indicates, this cooperation may be difficult to come by. Such difficulty, however, should not necessarily cause pessimism, but it should draw our attention to the fact that, unless student evaluation of faculty or teaching is to continue to be the Pro Forma ritual which allows all participants in the procedure to go on behaving as they always have, the instruments of evaluation must take a much more specific interest both in the teacher's ability to clearly articulate and pursue his objectives and in the student's ability to interpret such articulations and pursuits.

PROCEEDINGS OF

THE GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM (GRICC)
IN-SERVICE WORKSHOP

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Hosted by: Dr. Asa C. Sims, Jr.
Dean, Academic Affairs
SUNO

Southern University in New Orleans
New Orleans, Louisiana
January 6, 1976

GCRIC CONFERENCE

SUBJECT - Personnel Management

DATE - January 6, 1976

TIME - 9:00 am - 3:00 pm

LOCATION - Southern University in New Orleans

CONFERENCE COORDINATOR - Dr. Asa C. Sims, Jr. - Dean of Academic Affairs
SUNO

CHAIRMAN, EXECUTIVE COUNCIL - Mr. Herb Carnathan - Miss. Gulf Coast
Junior College

Summarized Comments

Participitory Management - Dr. Henry Wiggins, Chairman
Communication and Instructional Technology
Southern University, Baton Rouge, La.

Dr. Wiggins stated that Participitory Management

- was a necessary part of any Management System in a University.
- was an outgrowth of the Democratic process.
- was based on certain assumptions made about people, i.e., they are creative, willing to work, and they exercise self-control in the performance of their duties.
- embodied several principles of management in that each member of the Management team from top to bottom contributes in decision making.
- performance levels are clearly defined.
- was a centralized concept of management in the continuim from autocratic to democratic.
- is embodied in the Management by Objectives Concept and emphasizes 9-9 position in the Management Grid System.
- is a dynamic system as feedback information is continuously cycled.
- allows that duties and responsibilities be clearly stated in a job-description.
- allows for accountability at every level of management.
- was necessary so that student, faculty, etc. be a part of the decision making process.

Dr. Jim Fernberg, Director
Institutional Research
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, La.

Data elements neccessary in management

- Management Systems require data.
- Management Systems require Personnel data and must be consolidated from records in the President's Office, Personnel Office, Dean's Office, Registrar's Office, etc.
- A personnel coding system must be established to handle the many data components.
- Every institution needs data integrity on all personnel components, i.e., students, workers, faculty, classified employers and non-classified employees.
- The Participatory Management Concept applies to collection and maintenance of personnel data.
- Data collection is dynamic, it may be correct the first day, but on the second day it is out of kelter. It requires constant maintenance.
- Every institution will have to file with the Justice Department the EEO-6 form.
- Cautious that it must be done in an extremely careful manner.
- The main data elements in various categories should consist of the kinds of people in the University, i.e., officials, managers, faculty, other professionals, etc. Should give salary level, sex, race and other pertinent data.

List of Conferees

Mr. Herb Carnathan - Mississippi Gulf Coast Jr. College
James W. Fernberg - Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
Dr. Cecil Graves - Delgado
Dr. E. W. Bashful - Southern University in New Orleans
Dr. Robert E. Riehl - St. Bernard Community College
Dr. Henry Wiggins - Southern University in Baton Rouge
Mr. Willie F. Taylor - Bishop College
Dr. J. O. Carson, Jr. - University of Southern Mississippi
Robert Burrows - University of Southern Mississippi
David Chamberlin - University of Southern Mississippi
Bettye Cowand - University of Southern Mississippi
Roland Cranford - University of Southern Mississippi
Frances Dunagan - University of Southern Mississippi
John E. Hill - University of Southern Mississippi
Pauline Sommers - University of Southern Mississippi
Allen St. Martin - University of Southwestern Louisiana
Warren Fortenberry - Southeastern Louisiana University
Asa C. Sims, Jr. - Southern University in New Orleans
Burt Beck - Faulkner State Jr. College
Dr. Thames - Delgado
Howard Smith - Southern University in Baton Rouge

PROCEEDINGS OF

THE GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM (GRICC)
IN-SERVICE WORKSHOP

INCREASED STUDENT ACTIVITY AND INVOLVEMENT

Hosted by: Dr. S. D. Bishop

Bishop State Junior College
Mobile, Alabama
February 27, 1976

PROCEEDINGS
GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM MEETING
February 27, 1976

BISHOP STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE
MOBILE, ALABAMA

Conference Theme: Increased Student Activity and Involvement

The following institutions and institutional representatives were in attendance: University of Southeastern Louisiana: Warren Fortenberry, Libby Fortenberry; Bishop State Junior College: S. D. Bishop, W. F. Taylor, Frank Miller, Alfred Figures, Dorothy Raine, Dorothy Bivens, Hattie Caulton, Gabrieli Davis and Allen Rice; Faulkner State Junior College: Mary Cox and Marvin Waller; Southern University, New Orleans: M. F. Dyson, Eugene Green, Robert Smith, Jessie Jackson and Aubrey Zackery; University of Southern Mississippi: Frank Meeks, Lynn C. Daniels, Bill Farmer, Scott Johnson and J. O. Carson; University of Southwestern Louisiana: Glenn Manard, Cary Menard and Allen St. Martin; Delgado Junior College: Tom Assad, John Adams, Alice Rusbar and Patricia Smith; Gulf Coast Junior College: Carolyn Sand, Herb Carnathan, Alice Mott, Billie Lofton, R. C. Hobert, Kitt Glenn, H. K. Rouse, Ed Scarbrough, Cindy Farris and Michael O'Hara.

The morning session was started with greetings from Dr. S. D. Bishop, President. Introductions were made by the Consortium Chairman.

The first panel discussion involved student leaders from commuter colleges. Major points brought out in this discussion were:

A student from the Jefferson Davis Campus, Gulf Coast Junior College, spoke of a survey of all vocational students. He pointed out that the vocational student was an older student, most were married and most were working. They are not too interested in "student activities." He said that 3/4 of the students polled would participate if the program were interesting and in their area of interests. He suggested speakers in Vocational-Technical Fields might be a good avenue to pursue. He said that the VICA Club (Vocational Industrial Clubs of America) could be an effective tool to get more students involved.

It was suggested that the non-vocational student in the junior college is generally a person who still lives at home, has their own circle of friends and activities; that items of interests are extremely hard to identify and it is extremely hard to get these students involved in campus activities. Lack of interest and finances in commuter colleges made it very difficult to have real high quality programs. But, if such programs could be found and if the students could be brought into the act, there could be more improvement.

A student from S. D. Bishop suggested that the community college student body involve all community agencies possible. He suggested that the YMCA, YWCA, church and other civic activities be reached by as many students as possible.

It was suggested that student centers be well-equipped and the activities they are in be well publicized. Further, that there should be many activities in the student center to reach as many different types of students and student interests as possible.

Intramural sports of all kinds were recommended.

One student said that what the student needed most was time to sit and think.

In summary, the commuter college students stated a dire need for dynamic, innovative student leadership. The students need to become aware of problems and activities and they need to become involved with those problems and with the community. They said that to get the students to cooperate, administrators and faculty should show a genuine interest and attempt to keep the lines of communication open. The students want a more free hand in planning their activities. They want the administration to become involved, but they would like to run their activities more.

In the panel discussion for non-commuter institutions, it was pointed out that personal contact must be made by the administration and the faculty with the student. They recommended that there be scheduled times when all of the students could reach faculty and administrators. It was suggested that a complaint board would be a good item.

The question was raised, How to get blacks involved in student activities? A young black student suggested that having black faculty, administrators, advisors, etc. visible was a very good way to get involvement of black students.

It was pointed out that the University of Southwestern Louisiana had gotten students deeply involved into decision-making. There are many committees with 50% students and 50% faculty members. (For example, Student Financial Aid, where the President of the Student Government appoints the students and the President of the Institution appoints the faculty members.) Committees exist on curriculum matters, discipline, etc. The committees are deeply involved in governance of the institution. It was pointed out that this movement had to start slowly, but was now becoming most active and most beneficial to the institution.

The importance of a weekly newspaper was stressed.

A major problem encountered is that of communication and the image of the administration and faculty. For any program to be successful, it must be sold both to the faculty, the administration, and to the student body.

The importance of the student union with active participation of students and faculty and all groups therein are very important. It was suggested that there be many types of displays, workshops, etc., to attract as many varied kinds of student interest and needs as possible.

Following luncheon at the Admiral Semmes Hotel, hosted by Dr. Bishop, a paper was given by Mrs. Alice M. Rusbar, Delgado Junior College, New Orleans, La. The title of the paper was Student Activities or Entertainment. This paper is attached.

The administration, faculty, staff and student body of the S. D. Bishop Junior College are to be commended for an excellent program.

SUBMITTED BY:

Herb Carnathan

34

Herb Carnathan, Chairman

sa.

Student Activities

or

Entertainment

Alice Rusbar
Director of Student Activities
Delgado College
New Orleans, Louisiana
February 27, 1976

The philosophy of Delgado College Student Activities evolved from a knowledge of our student body. Institutional research gave us a demographic information that proved invaluable in the formation of our philosophy, the direction of our emphasis, and the thrust of our programming. Our student body is:

Commuter College
78% male
37% black
50% veteran
more night than day
more part time than full time
most controlled in associate degree programs than certificate
an average age of 29.

Most of our students are first generation college goers and over 70% have either full or part time jobs and attend college at the same time. The fact that Delgado College is in New Orleans--the entertainment center of the USA, for where else can you find Bourbon Street and a domed stadium--also contributed to the formation of our philosophy. Briefly, then, the Student Activities personnel are dedicated to the college ideal of helping each student fully realize his potential, academically, culturally and socially. We feel strongly that one of our objectives is to broaden the horizons of our first generation college goers; this, in turn, enables them to educate their children and others around them.

Consequently, we have developed a program geared to doing precisely these things. Perhaps a few specific examples may demonstrate the means taken to reach our objectives.

In response to SGA and student requests, we instituted a film series. Entertainment? Certainly. But keeping our objectives in mind, we choose films with an eye to more than entertainment. We choose films that are well acted and well directed. Our theatre can assign these films as additional work or substitute them for a formal class period. And why not? Isn't this a legitimate academic activity for theatre students? They can certainly learn much about acting from Sir Laurence Olivier, Richard Burton, Charlton Heston, and others.

Some of the films we offered last semester for the following reasons are:

El Cid - Excellently acted.
Beautifully photographed
Spanish Literature--a figure as well as Henry VIII or King Arthur in English Literature
Spanish history and culture

To Sir With Love-Understanding of Others
Acting
Cultural differences

Rebecca - Excellent acting
Creative writing

The Birds - Writing (sponsor of the creative writing class requested the birds
Good acting.

This semester we are showing a series of comedies. We sent a list of these films to the English Department so that they could, if they so desired, assign Henri Bergson's excellent essay on "Laughter" in which he discusses what makes for humor, why people laugh and what the psychology of laughter is. We spoke with the chairman of the social sciences department and suggested that a history of humor through films starring W. C. Fields and Mae West, the Marx Brothers, Laurel and Hardy, Abbott and Costello, and even Taylor and Burton in The Taming of the Shrew (notice this spectrum approach of Shakespeare, humor excellent acting, great photography, and superb entertainment) might be an interesting addition to their program of study as a reflection of the times.

No matter how great the selection of films, no matter how worthy the reasons for the selection, only a small number of our students is reached with a film series.

Consequently, we attempt by various means to reach a larger, more varied segment of the student body. We are scheduled to video tape an angiogram at one of the hospitals so that our radiological students can be instructed on procedure, technique--whatever--before they attend the "live" angiogram. This video tape will also be used to reinforce what the students have seen or participated in at the students' and instructors' convenience.

We are also scheduling guest speakers for various academic and vocational divisions, and these guest speakers will also be video taped so that all students, night-day, part-time, full-time, in a specific program will be able to benefit from the speaker's expertise. These men-women are experts in the students field. Again, the lecture will be permanent and reusable by students and faculty.

We are scheduled to have an International Student Week within the next month or so. This activity is a popular one and extremely successful. Foods from different countries are featured in the cafeteria during this week, exhibitions of articles from foreign countries are arranged in the library, and daily noon-time entertainment is presented in the cafeteria by the international students.

A committee is organized to choose the best entertainers and these students perform at the International Students Buffet on the Friday night of this week. This buffet is open to the general public. International Student Week is an additional and excellent opportunity for international students to participate in college activities and to help all of us understand their cultures.

Student activities responds to student requests for special speakers. We support and pay for guests the students are interested in inviting to our campus. A request from the students themselves almost guarantees student participation.

From what has been said, it is obvious that Student Activities is attempting to reach more and more of the students so that the objectives stated previously may be met. But there are still other things that can and will be done at Delgado. For student participation, the students themselves must be involved. We are going to reactivate a committee composed of student representatives

from every student organization on campus to help determine activities for the coming year. We consider their input both valuable and necessary. Most students want their extra-curricula college activities to be meaningful, challenging, and intellectually stimulating.

Providing student activities for our night students is more difficult than providing activities for our day students. Most of the night students are on campus only for their classes. Therefore, we think it is necessary to provide them, either through the student newspaper or through a special newsletter, with vital information, such as hours the bookstore is open during the evening, counseling (both veteran and general), health, and food services available to them on a daily evening basis.

Student activities devotes little time or money to general college dances or the acquiring of rock bands or groups. These activities are arranged extremely well by the Student Government Association. Also, we feel that given the entertainment possibilities within the city of New Orleans, the necessity for them is less than compelling.

Student activities should be for all students. To realize our objectives, we must continue to experiment with offerings that may not be traditional but which may fill the needs of our very untraditional students. And supposing our activities don't fill the students needs--suppose we make available to them things for which they have never experienced a need? For example, one of the curators of the New Orleans Museum of Art is coming to Delgado College on March 4, 1976, to present a slide program entitled "An Introduction to the New Orleans Art Museum." Students and faculty both are invited, and we hope to interest more than our fine arts and commercial arts students in attending. And if we can bargain a little with the New Orleans Philharmonic Symphony, we plan to have it on our campus soon. But not to give a traditional concert! We want them to do a very informal in-the-round concert demonstrating the various instruments, their effects, and what the conductor does to produce beauty out of a potentially chaotic situation.

Do all the students have a need for these and similar activities? Probably not. But don't we in Student Activities have the responsibility, if not to create a need, at least to make certain that enriching experiences are available to our student body?

PROCEEDINGS OF

THE GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM (GRICC)
IN-SERVICE WORKSHOP

THE ROLE OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Hosted by: Burton C. Beck

James H. Faulkner State Junior College
Bay Minette, Alabama
April 27, 1976

GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM
JAMES H. FAULKNER STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE
BAY MINETTE, ALABAMA, APRIL 27, 1976

"The Role of Occupational Education in Higher Education"

9:30 a.m.	Registration, Coffee
10:00 a.m.	Welcome, Lathem M. Sibert, President, J. H. Faulkner State Junior College
10:15 a.m.	Introduction, Burton C. Beck, Dean of Instruction J. H. Faulkner State Junior College
10.30 a.m.	"Occupational Education at the Post Secondary Level: Does it Belong?" - J. O. Carson, Jr., University of Southern Mississippi
11:00 a.m.	"National Trends in Occupational Education" - Tom Nevitt, University of Southwestern Louisiana
11:30 a.m.	"Postsecondary Education in Alabama" - Trish H. McLaney, Consultant, Post Secondary and Continuing Education - Alabama State Department of Education
12:00 noon	Tour of Campus
12:30 p.m.	Lunch - Cafeteria
1:30 p.m.	Discussion Groups: Group A, Room C-100 Jerry Comer, Leader Terrie Beck, Recorder Group B, Room C-102 John Gwin, Leader Bonnie Eubanks, Recorder
2:00 p.m.	Presentation of Group Findings
2:30 p.m.	Adjourn

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AT THE POSTSECONDARY LEVEL: DOES IT BELONG?

Introduction

The self-evident and categorical response to the question posed in the topic for this session of the consortium is an unequivocal "yes". Having so forthrightly and confidently disposed of the major issue before the conference, it might seem to be applaudable discretion, if I were to thank you for your attention and sit down.

It should not surprise us, however, is such a simplistic and cavalier disposition of a major issue in higher education should not be acceptable to some members of the group. At the least, some substantiation of this blunt solution may make some of us more comfortable about having spent our travel money.

This presentation will be divided into three sections. The first will support the assertion that occupational education has been a predominant function of higher education throughout the three hundred years of our history. The second section will propose definitions of the several key terms which frequently appear in the paper. These are postsecondary education, career, and career education. The third section will address five issues which must be reconciled if higher education is to make a maximum contribution to career education during the remainder of this century.

The Role of Occupational Education In The History of Higher Education

The history of higher education in the United States, and in Europe too for that matter, supports this "yes" response. Stephen Bailey, writing in the Fall 1973 Educational Record, reminded us that higher education in the United States has always been career or occupationally oriented. The Harvard of 1636 was founded to afford education for those destined to serve in the clergy. In the eighteenth century, higher education extended its sober concern to legal and political theory. Training men for careers of leadership - spiritual, intellectual, and political - was the dominant theme of America's first two centuries.

The original mold was broken in the ninteenth century due to the industrial revolution, the westward movement, and the progress of the secular sciences. In 1862, the Morrell Act created the land-grant institutions, dignifying and elevating the practical arts. It also focused attention on the manpower needs of an economy, exploding under pressures of civil war and resource exploitation. The Morrell Act was a thrust to the notion that higher education should be career oriented in quite specific ways.

Higher education in the twentieth century has been far more preprofessional or precareer in aim and content than is generally assumed. Think of the typical university structure by academic divisions. There are Schools or Colleges of Agriculture, Architecture, Art, Business Administration, Business Education,

Education, Engineering, Home Economics, Music, Physical Education, and Social Work. Though numbers of these programs, likewise, offer graduate degrees, all graduate programs are occupationally oriented. The generally post-baccalureate colleges are Dentistry, Law, Medicine, Theology, and Veterinary Medicine. Through majors in the several natural sciences and their subfields, colleges of science are essentially preparing their students for employment.

Even the non-professional literate careers like sales and retail services have looked to the liberally educated college-bred prospective employee for verbal facility and adaptability for career success. Employment is higher for those with a baccalaureate degree than for those without. Job satisfaction and job mobility are higher for college graduates.

James Thornton, in his book entitled The Community Junior College, divided the chronological history of the junior - community college into three periods. The sole function of the first era, dating from 1850 to 1920, was that of paralleling the offerings of the first two years of college. The second era, from 1920 to 1945, saw the introduction of two-year occupational programs to prepare students for immediate employment. The third era dates from 1945 to present, during which the continuing education and community service functions began to receive attention. This function of postsecondary education is now being entered aggressively by four year colleges and universities as well as by public school systems. Life-long education has its career or occupational facet at every postsecondary level, as socio-economic conditions precipitate the need for upgrading occupational education or retraining.Stephen Bailey, who was quoted earlier, pointed out that automation and the rationalization of complex enterprises into simple job components led to the reality that eighty percent of the jobs to be filled in the next ten years will require post high school but subbaccalaureate talent. This identification and assignment of subprofessional tasks to less trained employees is well advanced in some professions and is being adopted rapidly in many others. It is the preparation for this paraprofessional employment which has been the focus of occupational education in the community college for many years. As four year colleges become more costly and as the difference between entering job requirements and baccalaureate status becomes clear, students may opt for two-year college and proprietary school training instead of baccalaureate level education.

Labor market demands over the last forty years have reflected a sharp decline in unskilled and semiskilled jobs. High school graduates, even those of vocational programs, have been found to be undereducated for employment in modern industry and business. The overhead transparency which is projected on the screen best illustrates the changes in labor market demands and in the requisite level of education now required of the majority seeking to enter employment. This data in this transparency was published in Norman C. Harris' book entitled, Technical Education in the Junior College: New Programs for New Jobs.

The first two horizontal bars depict the 1930 Educational Spectrum based on data from the U. S. Office of Education. The 1930 Occupational Spectrum data was released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the U. S. Census. It can be seen that the percentage of unskilled and semiskilled workers just about matched the percentage of those whose educational level was grade school or less. The percentages of high school and vocational school graduates approximately match the percentages required in skilled, clerical and sales, and semi-professional employment.

The 1970 estimates predicated a decline in the percentage whose educational level was that of grade school and high school and a corresponding decline in employment requiring so little education. By 1970, it was estimated that fifty percent would be graduates of associate degree programs in community colleges, technical institutes and university extension centers. The prediction was that these would be matched by about fifty percent employment opportunities requiring this level of education. The percentages in the third parallel bar on the occupational spectrum are comparable to the eighty percent figure quoted previously in this paper, and, were calculated nine years earlier than was Bailey's figure.

It is clearly apparent, today, that students are shifting their priorities for occupational preparation from, for example, teaching to health related occupations. It is clear also, that there will be an oversupply of baccalaureate and graduate degree holders in proportion to job requirements. It is expected that many employees will be overeducated for the jobs they hold and that job educational requirements will be increased beyond true requirements because of the availability of degree holders.

Definition of Terms

The 1972 amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965, according to Joseph Cosand, speaking before the 1973 American Association for Higher Education Conference, constituted a revolution in higher education in this country. The amendments truly were to provide equality of educational opportunity for all through financial aid to students and general financial aid to institutions. Proprietary schools were included for the first time and provision was made for State Planning Commissions in every state. Community colleges were to be available in commuting distance of every youth in the nation. Vocational education was to be available to all.

The term postsecondary education was used for the first time in this legislation to include all higher education. Cosand reported that the National Council on the Finance of Higher Education as well as the Carnegie Commission had devoted sessions to an attempt to define the term postsecondary. He emphasized the necessity to reach agreement on the term since it is replacing the term higher education.

The tentative proposed definition is: A postsecondary institution is any public or private institution offering instruction beyond secondary school and enrolling students eighteen years of age or older who can profit from the education offered. This definition includes proprietary institutions, technical institutions, the armed forces, veterans organizations, business and industry, labor organizations, home study courses, and courses accepted toward an external degree. Cosand pointed out that the significant outcome of this definition would be to place emphasis on what is learned rather than on the type of institution in which it was learned. He cited as a goal and further outcome of this legislation that our pluralistic students must be provided for with quality offerings within a diversity of institutions and learning methods.

The meaning of the terms occupational, vocational, and technical education should be familiar enough to us not to require definition. They share the same function; that of preparing the student for immediately available, gainful employment.

Similarly, the term "career" carries an accepted connotation denoting the total course of a person's life with particular reference to its major focus or focuses. Career education, on the other hand, is a term of more recent coinage. Writing in the Summer 1973 issue of Educational Horizons, Jane Permaul quoted Sidney Marland's description of the concept as education which involves not only academic and vocational-technical thrusts of the entire educational system but also those relating to social, political and personal adjustment. Admittedly, in Marland's context these goals applied to the K-12 period. Who could improve on this statement in expanding it to apply to postsecondary education at any level?

Issues to be Reconciled

Certain issues emerge as the concept of postsecondary education expands in the last quarter of the twentieth century.

The first issue to be addressed is the role of undergraduate education in occupational preparation. The objectives are clear:

To provide equality of opportunity to all.
To equip every student with a marketable skill appropriate to him and to the society of which he is a part.

Stephen Bailey formulated two other objectives which were:

To save career education from becoming purely vocational.

To provide off-campus remedial programs in liberal studies for those whose previous education was purely career oriented.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in its publication, Graduates and Jobs: Adjusting to a New Labor Market Situation, offered the following recommendations for higher education:

College and universities should strengthen their occupational counseling programs.

College and university academic and career offerings should reflect changing student choices in response to occupational changes in the labor market.

When the role of graduate education is added, a significant agenda for higher education is described. Bailey's suggestions for the role of graduate education also relate to career education. These goals are as follows:

To describe professional careers, differentiating technical and paraprofessional training needed at various support levels.
To keep preprofessional training up-to-date.
To nourish intellectual standards.
To retrain and up-grade the professionals.

The second issue to be discussed is that of the relevance of the liberal arts to career education as a function of higher postsecondary education. According to Stephen Bailey, the myth persists that higher education is by and large non-career oriented. The liberal arts are viewed as useless. Students are asking for a more relevant collegiate experience. Perhaps, career education is a partial solution to making education more relevant.

Bradley Sagen, writing in the December 1973 issue of Liberal Education made a proposal which is germaine to the issue of the utility of liberal education and to its relevance to the current scene. He proposed a new model for undergraduate education - one which would replace the two most frequent models - namely, the nature of knowledge model and the student growth and development model. Both of these models, he stated, ignore perspectives important to professional success. He proposed what he termed the professional model to remedy the deficiencies of the other models.

The objectives of Sagen's model are as follows:

To clarify the role of knowledge as applicable to practical situations.
To delineate task oriented competencies, such as problem solving, necessary in a fast-changing world.
To establish vocational choice and career development as legitimate dimensions of personal growth, recognizing that work is a source of identity.
To develop an appropriate sense of responsibility.

Earl McGrath, in the October 1974 issue of Liberal Education, further clarified the relevance and utility of a liberal or general education. He pointed out that to stress career preparation without relating it to general education would be to mislead the present student. They may be able to earn a living but unable to deal with important matters related to their personal lives and their civic responsibilities.

McGrath's position reinforced the timeliness of Sagen's professional model for the organization of undergraduate education. McGrath proposed to interrelate career education and liberal or general education. Said McGrath, "To discuss values outside of the context of general education is to neglect the most perplexing educational issue of the day - namely, how to assist the rank and file in reaching decisions on today's complex political, social, and moral problems. That values should be inter-related to career preparation of the college educated is manifest in the shocking gap between occupational competence and low moral concern for the human consequencies of their acts."

Bradley Sagen clinched the case for value education as a function of occupational education by pointing out that the completion of a degree confers on most holders of the degree the power and influence to make decisions affecting others - hence, the obligation to use power responsibility through the development of a system of values.

The third issue confronting postsecondary education is the uncertainty surrounding the reality of the demand for off-campus non-traditional education. As a way of spending increased leisure, will people opt for education, employment or recreation? According to Hughes and Mills in Formulation Policy in Postsecondary Education, the Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary

Education believes that an increase in the number of enrollees in postsecondary, part-time, off-campus educational ventures will depend on federal student aid.

The fourth issue is that of the future of the independent liberal arts college. Earl McGrath expressed the opinion that survival of these colleges will involve their willingness to provide three services needed by American society. These functions relate to careers, values, and general education. The exigencies of the times make it prudent to orchestrate these three themes in one arrangement.

The fifth and final issue to be considered is that of the coordination and control of the system of postsecondary education which serves the nation. A large part of the strength of American higher education has been the diversity in types of institutions and their chosen functions.

Cosand has reminded us that in a period in which an increasingly pluralistic student population is seeking postsecondary education, higher education institutions must not be permitted to drift into an homogenous mass through emulation of one another. Institutions must complement one another. Institutions must have stated purposes and must adhere to those purposes. They must not strive to be all things to all people. Institutional purpose should reflect the resources and strengths available to each institution. Unjustified, existing duplication must be eliminated and prevented from occurring in the future, as needs change. Cosand declared that policing this duplication can be accomplished by the institutions themselves but, if they don't do it, it will be done for them by outside agencies.

Professional educators must educate legislators at state and federal levels in order that adequate provision be made for the totality of higher or postsecondary education without duplication or gaps. For this interaction between educators and legislators to be effective the latter must have complete confidence in the integrity of the former to propose an efficient and effective postsecondary package.

Conclusion

The major purpose of this paper has been to present a rationale for an affirmative answer to the question posed in the topic chosen for the conference. Yes, occupational education belongs as a function of higher education or postsecondary education, depending on with which term you are most comfortable. There was an attempt to document the contention that occupational education has always been a prime characteristic of all levels of American Higher Education.

It is evident from this paper that the growth of higher education in the last century has been characterized by an egalitarianism better to serve the diverse needs of an increasingly pluralistic society aspiring to join the mainstream of modern life.

It has been an intent of this paper to contribute to the increasing acceptability of the more inclusive term postsecondary in place of higher education. Further, the paper attempted to demonstrate that the goals of career education are appropriate to the higher or postsecondary level and

and that the term incorporates more than does the term occupational.

It has been the intent of this paper to suggest that undergraduate education, liberal education, both public and private, and continuing education have roles to play in achieving the goals of career education or occupational preparation.

Finally, the social, economic and political realities of the times urge upon the educator the necessity to preserve the diversity which has been the hallmark of American Education, by accomplishing the coordination and control which will be demanded by the society.

TRENDS IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

By Thomas A. Nevitt, Ed.D., University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, LA.

National trends in occupational education will most certainly be related to the national economy and the economy's affect upon employer needs. Most employers, however, will not predict their employment needs for two years, much less 10 years. This complicates the predicting of occupational trends from difficult to almost impossible. Employers additionally, have not reached the degree of employment that we can say that we are out of the employment slump or perhaps out of the recession. Because of the economy, budgetary constraints are impinging upon all of us and we are constantly reminded that occupational education costs more than education which requires only a textbook and a few chairs. But I would remind those who think of cutting occupational programs in these days of money shortages, of the consequences, as noted by the quotes in various periodicals that follow. Occupational education, thus, does not cost, it pays--to those who possess it.

We as educators, do not control the major forces that impinge upon us to compel us as professional practitioners to modify our programs. The part that we play in the process is to look at these forces and to determine how these forces will cause the professional practitioner to estimate what will be necessary to prepare the students under his direction to meet these and other challenges that will be thrust upon the students in their lifelong career. These forces operate mainly in the realm of categories that might be termed social, governmental, and technological. These categories, and similar divisions are arbitrary but permit clarity to enhance the discussion. We all realize that in the final analysis each of these will affect the other, and many times will defy scrutiny to determine which caused the other and can only be considered in the sense of gestalt or the "big picture." However, just as we do a job analysis to see the elements more clearly in jobs so we categorize ideas for discussion purposes. It is within this context that we discuss the "Future Trends in Occupational Education."

Before looking at these three categories the most obvious commentary, however, that one can make on the future of occupational education is that "academic" personnel have recognized its value in a time of job scarcity and this will result in a growth of programs in occupational education. The September issue of Money notes that many four-year degree graduates have hit the reality of the fact that only 20 percent of the population needs a four-year degree for employment and that to a number of employment counselors in the personnel departments of business concerns the baccaulaureate may be a hindrance to job placement rather than a help, especially where the individual does not possess some kind of saleable or manipulative skill. This shock has been traumatic among my academic friends of a purist nature who maintain that college courses need not be of vocational significance. This is not to belittle that proportion of the affluent population who can afford to pursue studies of a non-vocational nature. They can and do make a contribution. And I hasten to add that many of the academic type courses are necessary, as I think you will note later in my comments. It is just to emphasize that most parents as quoted in many periodicals expect a degreed person to be able to find employment successfully upon graduation. On the other extreme are those who quote the statistic of only 20 percent of the population needing a college degree, and interpret that to mean that no college training is necessary for the other 80 percent to understand this world and to compete in this industrial society. These individuals forget the contribution that a two-year associate degree can make to an individual's job-hunting skills and to the understanding of society.

In the February 9 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education Michael Scully says: "Supporters of such programs (Vocational) see them as providing a new educational synthesis between the life of the mind and the world of work. Critics say they represent 'rampamt vocationalism' and are short-sighted reactions to current economic conditions." He went on to quote one university provost: "Ther's just a terrible concern on the part of students about spending four years in college and not having anything to show for it in terms of employment." Terrel H. Bell, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, said recently, "The college that devotes itself totally and unequivocally to the liberal arts today is just kidding itself. Today, we in education

must recognize that it is also our duty to provide students with salable skills." The March 29 issue of Time notes that unemployment among new humanities B.A.'s is running at about a 15% rate--higher than the 14.4% registered by laborers." The same article says that "students are flocking to community and junior colleges...which are the nation's fastest-growing schools.... Some community college students are 'retreads' from more exalted degree programs." In Newsweek April 26 issue, we read, "Already some of the changes that the new pressures have produced are evident at many colleges. More and more administrators have begun to put heavy emphasis on vocational courses and vocational guidance. There is a growing awareness that many students may elect to attend college for a year or so, go to work, and then return. Adult college programs are proliferating all across the country. They are heavily attended. There is also growing interest in on-the-job training, the "proprietary schools" that provide instruction in a variety of vocations and above all in the ever more popular concept embodied in the two-year programs offered by some 1,000 community colleges. In every instance, the purpose of these innovations is primarily to make higher education a commodity designed directly for the marketplace."

Quoting further on Page 64, the article relates: "Of all the alternatives to the traditional college degree, it is the community college that has attracted the most attention. There are now more than 1,000 of these two-year schools, enrolling nearly 4 million students at an average cost of just $300 a year. They offer a freewheeling variety of subjects to almost anyone who wants to take a course. But they can also lead to paraprofessional jobs in health and law, and can train people as nurses, computer and lab technicians, and even flight controllers. Many award an 'associate' degree, which can be applied for credit at a four-year institution. 'Someone has described us as the "filling-station approach to education",' says Harold McAninch, president of Joliet Junior College in Illinois. Whatever it is nicknamed, the approach clearly has a market."

"To keep pace with the obvious popularity of career-oriented education, even four-year colleges and universities are making vocationalism the order of the day. Most schools now offer courses and programs that once would have been considered entirely outside the purview of

"higher" education."

One envies the college or university fortunate to have administrators who recognize the new emphasis on job skills. Many colleges or universities are still "kidding themselves" as Bell noted by staying with the traditional non-entry job level curricula.

From the obvious value to most of us here of occupational education we will attempt to delineate the problem forces beginning with Technology, followed by the Social Forces, and then see how Governmental actions influence the previous two, continually relating these to occupational education. We are aware of the breakdown of the strictly craft or trade tradition, and its ramifications. This breakdown has continued with rapidity during recent years. The change will continue to accelerate until in the near future, lines of demarcation between crafts will all but be eliminated except in a very few crafts. Today the carpenters in some of the newer unions are doing welding; the sheetmetal workers are also engaged in various welding activities as they are working on heavier gauge material. Incidentally, the sheetmetal workers and employers have a large operation of re-training under way with the Vocational-Technical Center at Ohio State.

To illustrate how technology relates to social problems to cause governmental intervention and that technology changes will not be without accompanying social problems the following is noted. Violence flared its ugly head in Lake Charles, Louisiana, recently when a general craft union was challenged by one of the old line craft unions. During the jurisdictional dispute one man was killed. The employer was using the members of the union on the job to do various kinds of work, including having each man responsible for operating the elevator to transport material for the multi-level building to whatever level was needed. The operating engineers objected to this procedure among others and violence ensued. The governmental authorites are prosecuting those responsible.

We know of the environmental problems created juxtaposition with the growth of technology in relationship with governmental requirements.

This area of governmental charge will be touched upon later. But I am sure you've heard of the man who was asking for a permit to build a huge boat in which he wished to transport animals. The dual problem of constructing and transporting animals obviously called for an environmental impact study when he applied for a permit to build the boat and transport the aminals. Upon applying for the permit, the bureaucrat asked him why he wanted to build such a boat to transport the animals away from their natural habitat. He replied that it was now raining and that the area would soon be flooded. "Who gave you that type of information?" the bureaucrat asked. The application seeker said that he had heard the information from an unusually reliable source. Nevertheless, he was told he would have to bring in the results of an environmental impact study by a university professor skilled in that area before the permits could be issued. Just saying an unusually reliable source would not be sufficient. By the way the bureaucrat asked what is your name? The man replied "Noah," "Is that your first name or last name?" The man replied just record the name as "Naoh." This is to illustrate the forces that may control the future of occupational education trends may not lie in the area of education.

It is not for us as educators to give value judgements about these types of social problems, but we will discuss these relationships in turn. We have a duty, however, to educate the student as the prospective worker to cope with the technological demands of his employer if the employer should require a more versatile; that is, the worker should know more than one craft. Thus, our job of educating will become more difficult as we continue to give that in-depth training necessary for preparation for entry level jobs and at the same time give the prospective worker the necessary versatility to wrk in various areas. This is one course of study change that I see as definite and awesome in occupational education: and that is of educating the worker in depth for an entry level position and at the same time parallelling this with the background to do allied work with little additional on the job training. Some educators, notably, Gillie, have said that schools should give a general background of training to the student and finish his skill for a particular job at a skill center when an employer indicates that he needs a worker with a particular kind of skill. The employer would, thus, determine the closing curriculum. I see this way of curriculum implementation as being difficult, is not impossible, to bring about for the prospective worker.

We have a duty, however, to educate the student as the prospective worker, to cope with the technological demands of his employer if the employer should require a more versatile worker as many employers are today. Technological forces are of such a nebulous nature that as was noted we have difficulty predicting employment for the next two years much less than for a ten-year period. Employers are the group having the most to gain from an accurate education or training forcast, nevertheless, they are most reluctant to tell what they see as their necessary requests for new employees. This compounds our estimate of what type of training should be provided in the future; however, the vocational acts and the private sector of employers continually stress the need for the public school administrator to be accountable for the students that we educate--and accountability to these people includes placement. We are constantly being bombarded by forms to show where the occupational student is being placed. An this is a reasonable request if kept in proper prospective.

Allied to the notion of preparing a versatile worker is a concept that the present day student must realize as never before, and that is the concept that education is a life-long process and that students cannot expect the educator to be a soothsayer capable of forseeing every eventuality of technological change. You know the student that returns to tell you that he could have profited more by taking course "X" rather than course "Y" which you required as part of his program of studies. As I see the future in occupational education, the worker returning for upgrading of skills may require a larger part of the budget than we are now allocating. The student as we have noted will need to see education as a life-long process and will have to discipline himself to be absent from the nightly routine of boobtoob watching and go to night-school attending. His alternative will be to find himself without saleable skills, as many of my generation are now finding themselves, where technology is passing them by and relegating them to early retirement. At least my generation had an excuse in that we were led to believe that once you had a skilled trade you were equipped for a lifetime of work in a particular occupation without the need for further training. Some of us were fortunate enough not to believe that erroneous idea, but others today are not so furtunate and are now

losing their jobs because of the advance of technology. However, I do not believe that technology change will be as rapid in the next few years. Technology will re-group because of the state of the economy, shortage of energy, and environmental difficulties.

I recently visited the newspaper where I served my apprenticeship and learned that the composing room personnel will be phased out when the new computerized typesetting system is installed. The reporters will input their stories directly to the phototypesetters--I'm not so sure that this system will take place. Another, but similar development is the use of secretaries to prepare the copy for typesetting on casettes. This could lead to the business education department as part of word processing to educating personnel for typesetting. This is a paralled development similar to the welders, carpenters and sheetmetal works of versatility built into the skills development of the worker. The future may raise such questions as to just who is responsible for educating such as welders, graphics arts, land constructors, personnel and can we go accross the disciplines for team teaching; and then an allied question is what group or union will bargain eventually for these people.

These developments just serve to further emphasize the obliterating of lines that have marked craft jurisdiction and the complexity of training problems that will result. Again the changing forces of technology will call for retraining and this will call for re-educating the educator, that is the teacher, to these new techniques as well, but this phase of in-service education has been often neglected--that of allowing sufficient time for sabbiticals for the educator to keep abreast of the new technologies.

We have not touched on methodology and the changes that will be necessary but the implications are evident and tremendous, if not frightening. The implications for individualized instruction is even more evident. Task analysis as being done by various organizations such as V-TECS, the Vocational-Technical Consortuim of the South, will standardize and up-date the curriculum in a way that we have not been able to accomplish in the past. Articulation will be better between the various levels as career education brings to the post secondary schools students who understand more about industry and the business world than those that we are currently seeing.

Leaving the technology implications, we focus upon the next force: those that are caused by social problems impinging upon the occupational education process. Two aspects are present when looking at the social responsibility of occupation education. One consists of those problems generally considered caused by what we would understand to be societal and, secondaly, those caused by the acts of the individual in social interaction. Societal problems are those connected with such problems as unemployment and the division of the income derived from the work produced, not to mention the area of distribution of profits. Again the two aspects of social problems are interwoven with the technological and the governmental. In addition to the excellent job that occupational education has always done in the area of skill preparation, and an adequate job for most students in attitude preparation, we must look at, and prepare our students to understand, the unusual predicament that an individual may be prepared for a job and the job not give monetarily, enough to sustain a minimum standard of living. Here we get into the political area of negative income tax for those that must work to satisfy the socialogical needs as pointed out by psychologists such as Maslow. We need not belabor the dicsussion but note that within the working life of those entering the labor force during the present time there exists the possibility that in their working lifetime their weekly income may not be sufficient, even though they are skilled, to meet their family's numerous needs. Preparation for this eventuality must be brought forth in occupational program, otherwise, the traumatic experience at an advanced working age may be deathly.

A statistic is often quoted that more people lose jobs because of the inability to adjust to the workplace than for any other reason, including skill, and such titles as absenteeism, alcoholism personality problems with other employees, bad attitude, etc., are listed. This fact would seem to argue that in vocational education we misplace our emphasis. I could never be startled by such figures as in most situations no other reason than attitudinal should exist for termination. It is obvious that we recommend for, or hire for, employment only those that we consider as having technical skills that will succeed in the job being considered. Also, all of us in occupational education know that it is easier to measure manipulative skills and technical information than it is

to measure attitudinal skills or personality actions under certain working conditions. We must do more, however, in an attempt to teach and measure in the attitudinal area that we have in the past. Consequently, I see occupational education becoming more serious in an attempt to improve curriculum in this area for individual social interaction.

In the division of profits and policymaking for corporations or large businesses it is evident that the workers may have as much to say as stockholders and in many companies will become the stockholders but, perhaps, not majority stockholders. I base this observation upon the social phenomenon where welfare recipients are demanding and getting more and larger payments, where tighter control is being exercised by groups on business practices of all kinds, where environmentalists in the minority are able to thwart the wishes of a majority. No value judgement is intended of these developments or the merits of such actions. The question that I am raising, I guess, is whether we are preparing youth in occupational programs to assume the duties and responsibilities of stockholders, and to develop the skills of managers and employers if they would be given this responsibility?

At present I believe not more than a small percentage of our graduates are in a position to exercise this responsibility. I see that occupational education will have the responsibility to help students to develop skills in value judgement or chaos will develop in the work place where everyone wants all income divided among those working for or having stock in, the company and nothing is left to develop new products for the company through research and marketing among other functions of the enterprise.

The reaching out of the hand of our government in to more and more parts of the manufacturing and business world is strikingly evident. The governmental control, or political control if you wish to call it that, of our governmental officials and of foreign leaders that impinge upon the occupational lives of all of us is everywhere. The need for, and consequently, the elimination of certain occupational training could occur almost overnight when our government or a foreign government changes it philosophy or its objectives. This action we have no way to predict.

Similarly, along with the questioning of nearly everything in every area of society by the

population or by certain members of society, has come the questioning of the use of many products of manufacturing such as materials and food. Again no value judgement is implied; however, what do you do for students to help them make better judgements as to worth of various options in these matters that are promulagated by the government. Perhaps, my generation and, yours if you're younger, squandered and/or misused our resources--and, perhaps we did so at the cost to future generations. But it is not too late for us to give the benefit of our generation's experiences to the future through occupational education. We have enjoyed a good standard of living for the most of our lives. Perhaps, the environmentalists are correct in their judgement of what should be done at the present time--but what if they find out that they are wrong. A generation may have suffered needlessly a lowered standard of living. As we know, a balance has to be struck between too much control and too little control which could lead to harm, and who can better judge technical values than a student educated in technology through occupational education. This person can be educated to see the two sides of the coin and help in forming sound judgements. This person sees the need to make a living but not at the expense of his health or the quality of life and I think we can teach such value judgements in occupational education so that the workers can make better decisions in areas of political concern.

I think that we will see more licensing of technicians in the future. The consumer is demanding that some evidence of competency be demonstrated in the making or the repairing of machinery or equipment. The electronics and TV area was among the first and now the automotive repair industry is getting in full swing in certification. Other technical areas are certain to follow. I think that it is best that the people with expertise in the field should be the individuals who initiate the necessary licensing procedures rather than waiting for governmental edict. This licensing procedure of determining what skills are necessary to perform in an area will speed up the development of task analysis studies that are now ongoining and the attendant performance objectives necessary for developing curricula, and should result in an even greater marriage of occupational education with job requirements. Post-secondary schools instructors should be equipped to administer

these licensing tests, but again, the requirement will be that they keep current of occupational practices.

I think that we see how technology, social and governmental concerns are intertwined to cause changes in occupational education. Occupational educators are equal to the task necessary for change as they always have been, and I think you will continue to see many good things happen in this area of education that will do much for the development of our economy and the youth and adults that we serve.

Bibliography

Cillie, Angelo C., Sr., Principles of Post-Secondary Vocational Education, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., Columbus, Ohio. 1973.

Money, Time Publishing Co., September, 1975.
Higher Education Chronicle

Time, Time Publishing Co. March 29, 1976

Newsweek, Newsweek, Inc., April 26, 1976

Minutes of The

GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM

Executive Council Meeting
St. Bernard Parish Community College
October 14, 1975

A meeting of the GRICC Executive Council was held during the noon hour at St. Bernard Parish Community College. Members present were: Willie Taylor - S. D. Bishop State Community College; Harold Clavier - St. Bernard Parish Community College; Asa Sims - Southern University in New Orleans; Frank Carroll and Cecil Groves - Delgado Junior and Community College; Joe Carson - University of Southern Mississippi; Allen St. Martin - University of Southwestern Louisiana; Bert Beck - Faulkner State Junior College; and Herb Carnathan - Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College. Members not present were: Warren Fortenberry - Southeastern Louisiana University, and Dr. Roosevelt Steptoe - Southern University System in Baton Rouge.

The following items of business were discussed:

1. Appreciation to host. The chairman expressed appreciation of the Council to our host, Harold Clavier, for the excellent tour, and outstanding program, and a fine meal. Arrangements for the meeting were exceptional, and the program reflected excellent planning.

2. Meetings planned for the year. Five meetings for the year were outlined as follows: Comments, when made, are found in parentheses.

October 14, 1975 - Evaluation - St. Bernard Parish Community College

November 24, 1975 - Personnel Management - Southern University System, Baton Rouge. (Dr. Roosevelt Steptoe, who has replaced Dr. Harrison, has contacted me and plans to recommend a date in December or January for his meeting. We will keep you advised of his plans.)

February 27, 1975 - Increased Student Activity - Bishop State Junior College, Mobile, Alabama. Host - Willie Taylor.

April 27, 1976 - Occupational Education at the Collegiate Level - Does It Belong? - Faulkner State Junior College, Bay Minette, Alabama. Host - Larry Purdy.

June 14, 1976 - Annual Board of Directors Meeting - Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College, Perkinston, Miss. Host - Herb Carnathan and Dr. J. J. Hayden, Jr.

3. Host officials' responsibilities were outlined and included planning of the events, notifying consortium Presidents and Executive Council members of the time, place and program; making necessary arrangements for the meeting (to include planning the program); and providing to the chairman the proceedings (which should include a copy of the agenda, and text or summary of each speakers' major points and such other documentation as may be desired). Evaluations would be welcome, if done.

4. Election of Officers and new domicile. The chairman reminded the group that the constitution provided for a change in domicile of the consortium with election of a new president. The charter president served two years, and this is the second year of the present chairman. Election will be held at the June 1976 meeting.

5. Planning for next year. The chairman requested members to bring to the next meeting a list of subjects that they want considered for inclusion in the 1976-77 consortium agenda. Also requested were comments on how many meetings are to be held, format for meetings, and other items that might help in planning for next year's operation.

6. Directory of Interests, Characteristics, etc. The chairman asked if it would be desirable to update the Consortium Directory for next school year. It was the general concensus that it was useful and should be done during the summer.

7. Possible new GRICC member. In his letter of resignation from the Executive Council, Dr. E. C. Harrison, now Vice President of Administration and Planning, Dillard University, evidenced interest in continuing with the Council. The Council was polled to see if they desired to extend an invitation to that institution informally. Receiving an affirmative answer, the chairman was asked to contact Dr. Harrison to see if Dillard would be interested in joining.

The meeting then adjourned to meet again at the next GRICC meeting.

MINUTES PREPARED BY

Herb Carnathan
Chairman

60

Minutes of the

GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM

Executive Council Meeting
January 6, 1976
12:00 Noon

1. Meetings for the remainder of the year were reviewed by the Chairman and Council Member input in the planning thereof was given as recorded.

a. February 27, 1975, Bishop State Junior College; Host, Willie Taylor, Subject, Student Activity. The Council members suggested students be invited to attend and participate in this program. It was suggested that member institutions bring their Student Council or Student Government leaders; that a two-hour session be held in the morning with students from commuter institutions and live-in institutions being separated; that the students report from each institution what they think would get more students involved, identify the different types of problems by commuter institutions and live-in institutions and other items. Willie Taylor said that he would get out with his invitation a list of questions for consideration by the students. In the afternoon a speaker would be provided, hopefully, by Delgado and Southeastern University to talk on two subjects related to student affairs.

b. April 27, 1976 - Faulkner State Junior College, Bay Minette, Alabama. Subject, Occupational education at the collegiate level; Host, Burt Beck or Larry Purdy. Burt commented that they were well into the planning and would be informing Executive Council Members and Presidents of their plans very soon. They hope to have present a national officer from AACJC.

c. June 24, 1976 - Annual Board of Directors Meeting at the Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College. Host will be Herb Carnathan. The main order of business will be to report on what we have done and talk on election of officers.

2. Planning for next year. Suggested program ideas submitted by Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College were given to executive council members. (See Attachment 1). In addition to the twelve subjects on Attachment 1, the following subjects were offered: Professional development of faculty - How do you get involvement; Continuing Education; hold special meetings for faculty members in comparable disciplines, for example; all the English teachers or a representative group of English teachers or History teachers, etc. from the institution; counselors and what is being done in the placement area in member institutions.

ALL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEMBERS ARE AGAIN URGED TO CHECK AROUND THEIR INSTITUTION AND FIND OUT WHAT SUBJECTS THEY THINK SHOULD BE OFFERED NEXT YEAR. THESE SHOULD BE PUT ONTO A LIST AND WE WILL SHARE THEM AT THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING TO BE HELD IN MOBILE.

3. The Chairman reported that he had received no word from Dr. E. C. Harrison, Vice President, Dillard University, on our inquiry as to his interest in Dillard joining the Consortium. It was suggested that one more contact be made with Dr. Harrison. (Letter sent January 15, 1976.)

4. Paper on analyzing Teacher Behavior, by Dr. Charles C. Davidson, U.S. Department of Research and Human Development. The Chairman announced that Mr. Mel

Usey, of Delgado Junior and Community College had contacted the undersigned regarding this paper being given to the Consortium. Should a program come up in the future, Dr. Davidson's paper will be considered, but it did not appear appropriate for inclusion in any program this year.

5. Harold Clavier's report on the Consortium Meeting at St. Bernard Parish Community College.

The Chairman noted that he had received a fine report from Mr. Clavier, and that appreciation was noted for his prompt submission. Reports on our meetings are put together into an annual proceedings. Dr. Asa Sims, host of the day, was asked to submit a comparable report to us as soon as possible so that it could be edited and prepared for the proceedings.

Meeting closed and all persons went home.

SUBMITTED BY:

Herb Carnathan
Chairman

Members present: Allen St. Martin, University of Southwestern Louisiana; Warren Fortenberry, University of Southeastern Louisiana; Joe Carson, University of Southern Mississippi; Cecil Groves, Delgado Junior and Community College; Asa Sims, Southern University, New Orleans; Willie Taylor, Bishop State Junior College; Burt Beck, Faulkner State Junior College and Herb Carnathan, Chairman.

MINUTES
GRICC Executive Council
February 27, 1976
Admiral Semmes Hotel - 12:00 Noon

The Chairman announced that the next meeting would be held at Faulkner State Junior College at Bay Minnette, Alabama on April 27, 1976; that Larry Purdy would be contacting members with details on the meeting.

The June Board of Directors Meeting will be hosted by Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College. Dr. Aubrey Lucas was requested to be the principal speaker and tell of his experience in moving from one University to another within the State of Mississippi. Dr. Lucas will not be available that date, but would be glad to speak on the subject. The Council recommended that the Chairman contact Dr. Lucas to see if an alternate date can be chosen for this presentation. The Chairman will check with Dr. Hayden and Dr. Lucas on this change. Notice will be given as soon as positive plans are made.

It was announced that Dillard University, Dr. E. C. Harrison, had declined to request joining the consortium. No further action on this item.

The Chairman asked for proceedings of the SUNO meeting to be provided soonest and asked Mr. Taylor for a copy of his proceedings as soon as they could be prepared.

Members were asked to make recommendations on the four topics to be covered in next year's meetings. Suggested topics are attached to these minutes. At the Faulkner meeting, it is hoped that the four subjects, and host institutions can be chosen.

Appreciation was noted to Dr. Bishop and Willie Taylor for their hospitality.

Submitted by:

Herb Carnathan

Herb Carnathan, Chairman

Attachment

sa.

SUGGESTED PROGRAM TOPICS FOR GRICC PROGRAMS

1976-77

MISSISSIPPI GULF COAST JUNIOR COLLEGE

1. Bring faculty together by department for one day's exchange of ideas. For example, the JD Business Department has a fine follow-up program that would be of interest to other departments. Most of our meetings have been for administrators. Need to involve faculty in more meetings. Suggest three of the four next year be faculty department-oriented.

2. Energy (If anyone is really doing great things, it should be shared).

3. Student recreation and cultural activities.

4. Catalog preparation and brochures.

5. Public Relations (Not just those related to the PR Staff).

6. Long Range Planning.

7. VA Requirements regarding academic progress of Veterans (including probationary policies).

8. Admission testing, including placement tests and current practices.

9. Placement Services - What others are doing?

10. Student activities on a commuting campus.

11. Interfacing personnel and payroll systems on the computer.

12. How do libraries do their thing?

Professional Development of Faculty - How do you get involvement?

Continuing Education

Counselors and Placement

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 3 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

MINUTES
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
GULF REGIONAL INTERSTATE COLLEGIATE CONSORTIUM
APRIL 27, 1976
JAMES H. FAULKNER STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE
BAY MINETTE, ALABAMA

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Herb Carnathan during the noon hour. Persons present were: Harold Clavier, St. Bernard Parrish Community College; Ken McManis, Delgado Junior College (for Frank Carroll); Allen St. Martin, Southwestern Louisiana University; Burt Beck, Faulkner State Junior College; W. F. Taylor, Bishop State Junior College and Joe Carson, University of Southern Mississippi.

Annual Board of Directors Meeting. The Chairman announced the Annual Board of Director's Meeting would be held at Perkinston, June 30, 1976. Dr. Aubrey Lucas, President, University of Southern Mississippi, would be the principle speaker. It was announced that Alabama Lutheran would not be present. A letter will be forthcoming of the exact time and reminding all Presidents and Executive Council Members to put that date on their calendar.

Proceedings for the Bay Minette Meeting. Burt Beck was asked to get the proceedings on his meeting into the hands of the Chairman as soon as possible so that the annual report could be put together.

Election of Officers. Members were advised that an election of officers would be held in the June meeting.

Delgado Representatives. The Chairman mentioned that Frank Carroll had called and would not be able to attend because of other pressing committments; that Cecil Groves was sick and would not be able to attend. Two cars from Delgado was in attendance, however, one from the City Park Campus and one from the West Bank Campus.

Planned Meetings for Next School Year. The Executive Council selected four dates, subjects of meetings and locations for GRICC Programs next year.

DATE	SUBJECT	LOCATION
9-21-76	Fine Arts Department Meeting	Delgado Junior College
10-26-76	Placement Services	University of Southern Mississippi
2-15-77	Long Range Planning	Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College
4-29-77	Public Relations	University of Southwestern Louisiana

Note of Appreciation. Appreciation was noted to Burt Beck and Dr. Latham N. Sibert, President, Faulkner State Junior College, for hosting the fine meeting on the Subject: The Role of Occupational Education in Higher Education.

Meeting adjourned.

65

Herb Carnathan

Herb Carnathan, Chairman

57